

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
SAVANNAH DIVISION**

NASH N. TUTEN,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO. CV422-091
)	
SHALENA C. JONES, Chief)	
District Attorney of Chatham)	
County, individual and official)	
capacities; ANTHONY BURTON,)	
Assistant District Attorney,)	
individual and official)	
capacities; CITY OF SAVANNAH)	
PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE; STATE)	
OF GEORGIA; and CHATHAM COUNTY)	
SHERIFF'S OFFICE;)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

O R D E R


Before the Court is the Magistrate Judge's June 28, 2022, Report and Recommendation (Doc. 9), to which Plaintiff has not filed objections. After a careful review of the record,¹ the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 9) is **ADOPTED** as the Court's opinion in this case. As a result, Plaintiff's claims against Defendants²

¹ The Court reviews de novo a magistrate judge's findings to which a party objects, and the Court reviews for clear error the portions of a report and recommendation to which a party does not object. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see Merchant v. Nationwide Recovery Serv., Inc., 440 F. Supp. 3d 1369, 1371 (N.D. Ga. 2020) (outlining the standard of review for report and recommendations (citing Macort v. Prem, Inc., 208 F. App'x 781, 784 (11th Cir. 2006) (per curiam))).

² Perhaps due to the confusing language in Plaintiff's Complaint, the Defendants are listed incorrectly on the Court's electronic

Shalena C. Jones, Anthony Burton, City of Savannah Public Defender's Officer, State of Georgia, and Chatham County Sheriff's Office are **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.³ The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to close this case.

SO ORDERED this 19th day of July 2022.



WILLIAM T. MOORE, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

filing system. The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to amend the docket to conform with the case caption that the Court has used in this order.

³ The Court notes the Magistrate Judge gave Plaintiff an opportunity to amend his complaint (Doc. 9 at 8 n. 2.), which Plaintiff did not take. Accordingly, the Court finds dismissal with prejudice is warranted.